



# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/505,913	02/17/2000	Ronald A. Katz	245/247(6046-101D7)	7196
35554 75	590 03/04 <b>/2</b> 005		EXAMINER	
REENA KUYPER, ESQ.			WOO, STELLA L	
BYARD NILS	SON, ESQ. BOULEVARD		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 810			2643	
LOS ANGELES, CA 90069			DATE MAILED: 03/04/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	09/505,913	KATZ, RONALD A.				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Stella L. Woo	2643				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply  A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  Status  1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 19 January 2005.						
l	action is non-final.	•				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims						
4) Claim(s) 16-141 is/are pending in the application.  4a) Of the above claim(s) 112-141 is/are withdrawn from consideration.  5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  6) Claim(s) 16-111 is/are rejected.  7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.  8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
10) The drawing(s) filed on 17 February 2000 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.						
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).						
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  a) All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
Attachment(s)						
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary					
<ul> <li>2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)</li> <li>Paper No(s)/Mail Date</li> </ul>	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa 6) Other:	te atent Application (PTO-152)				

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Page 2

### Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

2. Claims 16-43 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 16 has been amended to recite the control system "utilizing the request data entered by the active buyer to locate a select vendor from a plurality of vendors identified to the control system, the control system upon locating the select vendor providing audio, dynamic video and text from at least said select vendor to said active buyer responsive to said commercial transaction data." However, according to applicant's specification, a video presentation is provided by an interested vendor who has responded to a request for proposal distributed from a buyer (page 43, lines 4-25). Therefore, the select vendor is merely the particular vendor who has responded to a buyer request, not a vendor identified by the control system. There is no description of the video presentation being provided by a vendor selected by the control system in response to the commercial transaction data provided by the buyer.

Should the new matter be removed from independent claim 16, the following rejections would apply.

Art Unit: 2643

# Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 4. Claims 16-42, 45-72, 75-105, 108-111 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shavit et al. (US 4,799,156, hereinafter "Shavit") in view of Smith (US 5,450,123), and further in view of Filepp et al. (US 5,347,632, hereinafter "Filepp").

Shavit discloses a commercial transaction communication system (Interactive Market Management System 50), the system being adapted for use with an on-line computer service (Shavit provides for access to a variety of information sources and database providers, e.g. Dialog; col. 7, lines 9-15), comprising:

an interface (personal computers 62, 64 and communications interface 79; col. 5, line 28 - col. 6, line 51);

an audio system (interactive conversational service; col. 7, line 58 - col. 8, line 4);
a text system (mailbox service, col. 8, lines 12-22; col. 11, line 52 - col. 12, line 18;
transaction service, col. 12, line 42 - col. 14, line 21., facsimile service, col. 14, line 22);
a storage memory (database stores subscriber data and request data; col. 7, lines 23-46;
col. 25, lines 28-50);

a control system (central processor 80).

Shavit differs from claims 16-42, 45-72, 75-105, 108-111 in that it does not specify a

Art Unit: 2643

dynamic video system. However, Smith teaches the desirability of including a camera at a representative terminal so that direct, real-time, point-to-point video communication can take place between a customer and the representative (col. 3, lines 26-27; col. 4, lines 25-28; moving pictures are communicated via AT&T 2500 video telephone sets, col. 1, lines 27-28) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such dynamic, full-motion video communication, as taught by Smith, within the system of Shavit in order to provide a real-time video as well as audio communication between the customer and representative. In this way, a more realistic face-to-face meeting can take place.

Further, Smith teaches the desirability of allowing buyer access to a vendor supplied video image stored in a video file server (video source and database 6) for enhancing sales communication with the use of video (col. 1, line 51 - col. 3, line 27) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such use of video, as taught by Smith, within the method of Shavit in order to allow a buyer to view the desired goods or services.

The combination of Shavit and Smith further differs from the claims in that although Smith provides for supplying customized information (col. 5, lines 48+), it does not specify storing in memory identification data of an interested buyer in association with a designated area of commercial interest. However, Filepp teaches the desirability of storing user data in association with a designated area of commercial interest in order to provide targeted advertisements according to collected parameters (col. 9, lines 27-47) such that it would have been obvious to incorporate such customization of advertisements, as taught by Filepp, within the combination of Shavit and Smith so that potential buyers receive targeted promotional e-mail messages regarding products that would more likely interest the particular buyer.

Art Unit: 2643

Regarding claims 19-20, 41-42, 48-49, 68-69, 81-82, 101-102, Smith provides for a dynamic video source and database 6.

Regarding claims 21, 50, 83, Shavit provides for printing documents via facsimile (col. 14, line 22).

Regarding claims 22-23, 51-52, 84-85, 1 10, the examiner takes Official Notice that it is old and well known in the art at the time of invention to provide for freeze-frame and high resolution video capability in a video communication system such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such well known video features within the combination of Shavit and Smith.

5. Claims 43-44, 73-74, 106-107 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shavit, Smith and Filepp, as applied to claims 16, 45 and 77 above, and further in view of Donald et al. (US 5,053,956, hereinafter "Donald").

The combination of Shavit, Smith and Filepp differs from the claims in that although it provides for displaying products to the customer (Smith, col. 2, lines 65-68), it does not specify an inventory control system. However, Donald teaches the desirability of coupling an interactive video display system with an inventory control system (col. 7, lines 3-9; col. 9, line 61 - col. 10, line 4) so that a customer can view products along with the number available in stock such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such coupling with an inventory control system, as taught by Donald, within the combination so that the customer can be apprised of availability while the seller's inventory database is kept current as items are purchased.

Art Unit: 2643

## Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 19, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding the rejection of claims 16-43 under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, Applicant argues that pages 39-41 of Applicant's specification provides support for the control system functions of locating a select vendor using request data entered by an active buyer and upon locating a select vendor, providing audio, dynamic video and text from the vendor to the active buyer. The examiner disagrees. Pages 39-40 describe a vendor who calls the system in order to prepare a video presentation for a particular product, which is identified by a merchandise code. Page 41 describes storing the video presentation in a file server and isolating all buyers associated with the particular product in order to notify the select buyers as to the availability of the video presentation. There is no description of locating a select vendor. Rather, it is the buyers who are selected by the system, not the vendor.

Regarding the rejection of claims under 35 USC 103, Applicant generally argues the "questionable combination of three references from distinct PTO classifications which teach away from the combinations of the claims." However, each of the applied prior art references to Shavit, Smith and Filepp is directed to the field of Applicant's endeavor, namely, commercial transaction communication between a buyer and vendor. Regarding the "commercial transaction data," in Shavit, a buyer enters a request for quotation for a desired product (col. 25, lines 28-50), which can be considered as "commercial transaction data."

Art Unit: 2643

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stella L. Woo whose telephone number is (703) 305-4395. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Tuesday, Thursday-Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Curtis Kuntz can be reached on (703) 305-4708. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Stella L. Woo Primary Examiner Art Unit 2643